

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SCOTT N. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-10-2019 KJM-GGH

vs.

LACK FAMILY INVESTMENTS, LP,

Defendant.

SCOTT N. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-11-0003 GEB-GGH

vs.

LACK FAMILY INVESTMENTS, LP,

Defendant.

RELATED CASE ORDER

Examination of the above-captioned actions reveals that they are related within the meaning of Local Rule 123(a). Both actions involve the same parties and similar questions of fact. Accordingly, the assignment of these matters to the same judge is likely to effect a substantial savings of judicial effort and is likely to be convenient for the parties.

The parties should be aware that relating cases under Rule 123 causes the actions to be assigned to the same judge – it does not consolidate the actions. Under Rule 123, related

1 cases are generally assigned to the judge and magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was
2 assigned.

3 As a result, it is hereby ORDERED that CIV S-11-0003 GEB-GGH, is reassigned
4 from Judge Burrell to the undersigned. Since Magistrate Judge Hollows is already assigned to
5 both cases, there is no need to assign a new magistrate judge. Henceforth, the caption on
6 documents filed in the reassigned case shall be shown as: CIV S-11-0003 KJM-GGH.

7 It is further ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court make appropriate adjustment
8 in the assignment of civil cases to compensate for this reassignment.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 DATED: April 22, 2011.

11 
12 _____
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26